



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR BOARD OF ALDERMEN MEETING OF MONDAY, APRIL 3, 2006

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Miles called the Regular Meeting of the Board of Aldermen to order at 7:30 p.m.

Following the Pledge of Allegiance, President of the Board Marilyn Ottenad gave the invocation.

2. ROLL CALL AND STATEMENT OF QUORUM

Roll call showed those present were Alderman Clement, Alderman Wilson, Alderman Tullock, Alderman Ottenad, Alderman Wandishin, Alderman Ruecker, Mayor Miles and Attorney Gunn. A quorum was present.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

a. Minutes from the March 20, 2006 Public Hearing regarding the proposed new Code of Ordinances

Alderman Clement made the motion to approve the Minutes from the March 20, 2006 Public Hearing regarding the proposed new Code of Ordinances. The motion was seconded by Alderman Ottenad and carried unanimously.

b. Minutes from the March 20, 2006 Public Hearing regarding a request to change the list of Permitted and Specially Permitted Uses in the Commercial Zone District to allow for Governmental Uses

Alderman Ruecker made the motion to approve the Minutes from the March 20, 2006 Public Hearing regarding a request to change the list of Permitted and Specially Permitted Uses in the Commercial Zone District to allow for Governmental Uses. The motion was seconded by Alderman Clement and carried unanimously.

c. Minutes of the Regular Board of Aldermen meeting of Monday, March 20, 2006

Alderman Tullock made the motion to approve the Minutes of the Regular Board of Aldermen meeting of Monday, March 20, 2006. The motion was seconded by Alderman Clement and carried unanimously.

4. ESTABLISHMENT OF ORDER OF ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Alderman Wilson made the motion that item 9 (b) be removed from the agenda. He said he is not finished with his review of the Code, having only completed about 150 pages, approximately 20 percent. He asked if the Board has had the chance to review the Ordinances, and he would like to have some work sessions to work through this Code more thoroughly. The motion was seconded by Alderman Tullock.

Alderman Ruecker said he had received a letter from Sullivan Publications, stating that they had reviewed Alderman Wilson's concerns, and saw no reason to hold up the adoption of the new Code. Sullivan Publications advised that most of Alderman Wilson's concerns were issues that existed before the codification began several years ago and would be best solved on a case-by-case basis. He said this process has been going on for a number of years, the process had been going on since before 2003 when he left the Board, and he thinks the Board should move forward.

Alderman Wilson said there are more issues he has with the Code. He said there are a great number of sections that are new, such as animal regulations and fair housing. He said the list given to the Staff on Wednesday is not all inclusive.

Alderman Ottenad asked why, since it was suggested at the last meeting, that suggestions be forwarded to the Staff the week of the meeting, and that Alderman Wilson did not raise objections at that meeting. She asked Alderman Wilson how long he and Alderman Tullock had the Code.

Alderman Wilson said he had not had the Code long enough to review it, only about four weeks.

Attorney Gunn said that the changes to the prior Code are very insignificant draftsmanship changes. He said the members of the Board had the Code for a couple years, and that Alderman Wilson has had the Code for almost a year, since he came on the Board.

Answering Alderman Wilson's comments, Alderman Ruecker said that many of the Board members have looked at the Code, in final form or not, for a long time. He said the problem is that evidently Alderman Wilson and Alderman Tullock have some issues with the Code, but if the Board changes after the April 4 elections, there will be new people who will come on the Board and spend their time reviewing the Code, and if it takes them a year also, and it takes the next Board another year, this process could go on ad infinitum, and he feels the Board should move forward and pass it. He said if there are specific Ordinances that are a problem, those Ordinances can be modified by consensus of the Board.

The motion failed 4 – 2.

5. CONSIDERATION OF PETITIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

a. Presentations pertaining to electronic surveillance of traffic lights

Chief Connolly said that as would be recalled from a meeting previously, a citizen had suggested the City enter into a contract with a red light camera vendor. He said he had selected two vendors that he feels are good and they have current interests in the metropolitan area, and they will each give a presentation. He said he would defer the viability of each of them and the global prospect to the Board. He said he wanted to present information from the vendors for the Board to decide if they wanted to pursue the surveillance system, and if so, when. He said he thinks it is a good tool; the true spirit of traffic enforcement is accident reduction, and this is what these systems are all about. He said if accidents can be reduced even 30% to 40%, it is a success, regardless of whether or not it is a moving violation and regardless of revenue derived from it.

Chief Connolly said that he did not have a timeframe for installation of a system. He said his position at this point is to present an informational package for the Board to decide if this is something the City wants to pursue, and if the Board does want to pursue this, whether they want to do it now or wait until some of the pending legislation is determined. He said if the Board wants to pursue this avenue, the vendor would then need to be chosen.

1. Redflex Traffic Systems

Chief Connolly introduced Mr. Mark Etzbach and Mr. Don Nelson.

Mr. Etzbach gave a brief history on his affiliation with Redflex, with the corporate office in Scottsdale, Arizona. He then stated that part of their solution incorporates full-motion video, including six second pre-violation footage, six second post-violation footage. He said they have contracts in 11 countries, and in the United States, they have contracts with 85 cities in 16 states, with 570 digital systems in the ground running. He said they have more systems in operation today than all other companies, and they have the longest demonstrated history, which he explained. He discussed their system in Chicago, the staffing and then said the violator call center and the help desk are operational 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Mr. Etzbach advised that the equipment has an 8,000-citation-per-hour capacity. He discussed the intersection collision reductions in areas with the system, the four cameras in the housing, and the 12 second full-motion video. He explained that the housing is bullet proof, vandal proof, and weatherproof. Mr. Etzbach further explained the system operation and gave a video presentation, explaining the system capabilities. He said they work with local subcontractors who actually do the installation work, and hardware, software, and maintenance is all included.

Answering Alderman Tullock's question regarding fees, Mr. Etzbach stated that depending on what happens with the Missouri Legislature, it may be a requirement that this involve a flat fee. He said they have several structures, the fee-for-service model, for instance. He said they are very flexible in working with cities.

Mayor Miles asked how intersections are chosen, and Mr. Etzbach said they work with the City to identify specific areas; they especially look at accident history and target those areas.

Answering Alderman Clement's question about signage and the issue of legality, Mr. Etzbach stated that there can be signs at each entry of the City that there is photo enforcement, or at each red light there can be signs regarding photo enforcement. Regarding legality, Mr. Etzbach said that the system and process are constitutional, but there is sometimes an issue with how the program is being run.

Alderman Ottenad asked if there was a Bill on the state level to outlaw the cameras, and Mr. Etzbach responded that there was a Bill that was proposed, but there is now an enabling Bill. He said that Tim Fischesser of the St. Louis County Municipal League said he wasn't sure the enabling legislation would pass. Answering Alderman Ottenad's question, Mr. Etzbach said that the City of St. Peters is waiting to see the outcome of the pending legislation.

Alderman Ruecker asked for clarification that the license plate, the person driving, and the shot of the car, and the video would be recorded, and Mr. Etzbach said that was correct. He further explained the system.

Answering Alderman Tullock's question about municipalities in Missouri with pending installation, and Mr. Etzbach said the only one pending is St. Peters where they were selected by competitive bid.

Alderman Wilson asked about the reliability of the system, and Mr. Etzbach said there are four detection devices. He said they can do video detection, laser, radar, induction loop or piezo loop. He said that only when vehicle presence is detected do they start capturing a series of images. He said they install completely new sensors; they keep it autonomous from the existing system. He further discussed reliability.

Alderman Wilson said that regarding revenue, if this procedure is successful, people will stop violating the law, and there will be no revenue. He asked for comments in that regard.

Mr. Etzbach said that they do quantitative analysis to provide an actual baseline and they realize that there will likely be a 50% reduction in red light running, and with those particular numbers, they are pretty confident over 570 installations where the individual city's numbers will be, and they are comfortable that the City would pay for the program at no cost to the City. He said there is a cost neutrality guarantee even with the fixed-fee basis so the City would never pay more than what is collected from the violators.

Alderman Wilson asked how the data is collected from the cameras, and Mr. Etzbach said it is all digital, so it is encrypted at the point of capture. He said they use photography that is hacker-proof. He added that it is sent by a virtual private network to their location in Scottsdale, Arizona, where it goes through three levels of review, followed by a final level quality assurance, and then it is made available to the Police Department to review and authorize. The Police Department makes a decision whether a ticket should be issued or not, and ticketing is usually within five to seven business days.

Alderman Wandishin asked a question about liability, whether it lies with the person owning the vehicle or the driver, and Mr. Etzbach said that depends on the pending legislation in Missouri.

2. American Traffic Solutions (ATS)

Mr. Dan Reeb from American Traffic Solutions said they are the vendor for the Arnold and Florissant locations. He said that Arnold is the first location in Missouri to have the system, and they have contracts now with Beverly Hills, Missouri and Sugar Creek, Missouri.

Mr. Reeb showed footage from the Arnold, Missouri intersection near a school where there was almost a school bus/car collision. He said cameras should be put up at the most dangerous intersections to modify behavior at those locations, and he talked about signage for the photo enforced intersections.

Mr. Reeb said that there are over 170 cities in the USA that have their program, the first being New York City which was implemented in 1994, which resulted in a 72% reduction in violations, a 41% reduction in collisions and a 35% reduction in fatalities. With the digital equipment, he said the prosecutable violations captured are much higher, approximately 80%.

Mr. Reeb said that the State of Missouri conducted a poll after the Arnold, Missouri system was operational, and a large percentage, 80% or more, of citizens are in favor of the technology. He said the system is web-based, so wherever there is access to the internet with proper authority, the system can be managed. He explained the above-ground and in-ground loop detection systems.

Mr. Reeb then discussed the single-camera technology which monitors the section 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and detects up to four lanes at one approach, and he discussed the capturing of the license plate. He said lane straddlers are caught in the single-camera system. He explained the violation process workflow, the police review screen and the ticketing process, with the citation going out to the registered owner of the vehicle. He said the violator can go to the internet, and with certain information, view the violation. The court also can access this information. He said on-line payment options are offered.

Answering Alderman Ruecker's question, Mr. Reeb said it is possible with their system to also take facial photos. He said that Arnold and Florissant are doing rear-only shots, no facial photos. Alderman Ruecker said he felt having the photo of the violator would be helpful for many reasons, and

he didn't feel that was an invasion of privacy. Mr. Reeb said that a second camera would be required to capture the face shot, and the City would make the decision as to whether or not to capture the facial shot.

Alderman Tullock asked how enforcement takes place with vehicles over 12,000 pounds that are not required to have rear license plates. Mr. Reeb said it would be up to the City to decide if they want to have a camera set up to take photos of the front of the vehicles; that hadn't been a major issue in other locations.

Answering Alderman Tullock's question regarding increases in rear-end collisions in locations where the cameras are installed, Mr. Reeb said that rear-end collisions occur, while more dangerous accidents are lessened, but the rear-end collisions have not been an issue in the State of Missouri.

Alderman Tullock asked about the timeframe between the violation and the notice to the vehicle owner, and Mr. Reeb said that ticketing usually occurs in five to seven days.

Alderman Clement asked about the strobe, the white flash, and he wanted to know if that was creating hazard issues with traffic at night, and Mr. Reeb said it is not an issue; it is never in the eyes of the oncoming traffic.

Alderman Wandishin asked if there were demo products of the software for the Police Department's viewing, and Mr. Reeb said with access to the Internet that wouldn't be a problem.

Alderman Ottenad talked about the car owner receiving citations when the car is being driven by someone else, if pictures are not taken of the driver. Mr. Reeb said the Ordinance could be written however desired. He explained that in Arnold and Florissant, there is a rebuttable presumption that the owner of the vehicle is the driver; the owner can rebut the presumption, and the actual driver of the car needs to be named. Mr. Reeb said for certain enforcement would be to picture the license plate and to send the ticket to the car owner.

Alderman Wilson asked about having cameras on the opposite side of the intersection to take pictures of the driver and Mr. Reeb said that would be possible.

Alderman Ruecker pursued this question further, and Mr. Reeb clarified that running a red light would only trigger one camera, so that would not result in a face shot of that particular vehicle

b. Comments from the Public

Mayor Miles recognized Boy Scout Seth Hayes of Troop 786 who said he is working on his "Citizenship in the Community" merit badge.

Ms. Mary Willson, 926 Brookvale Terrace, stated that her father was killed in a car accident at Big Bend and Country Stone, and without the assistance of Officer Gonzalez, the violator would never

have been found guilty of the crime. She said that if red light cameras had been at the intersection, maybe this woman would have been found easily.

Ms. Willson said that she was very disturbed about Alderman Wilson's comment about revenue; she thinks it is despicable that he thinks traffic tickets are more important than human life.

6. REPORTS FROM THE MAYOR

a. Presentation of 30-year Service Award to City Attorney Patrick R. Gunn

Mayor Miles said he had the honor to present to the City's good counselor for 30 years, in appreciation of dedicated service from April 1, 1976 to April 1, 2006. Mayor Miles said that Attorney Gunn has done an excellent job, he is very happy and proud of Attorney Gunn. Attorney Gunn received a standing ovation.

Attorney Gunn acknowledged his wife, Ann, and he said they would be celebrating their 35th anniversary in January. He said that with Ann was their 26-year-old son, Ryan, and he wanted to acknowledge his daughter, Bridget, who couldn't be at the meeting, but whom he also loves very much. Attorney Gunn then acknowledged his assistant, Sandy, who will have been his assistant for 30 years next month. He acknowledged his brothers and spouses: Jim and his wife, Leota; Tom and his wife, Kathy, and Michael and his wife, Carolyn. He said he was moved beyond words that they would take time out of their busy schedules to be at the meeting. Attorney Gunn received a second standing ovation.

b. Reappointment of Ms. Lillian Katzenmeyer to the Historic Review Commission

Alderman Clement made the motion to reappoint Ms. Katzenmeyer to the Historic Review Commission. The motion was seconded by Alderman Wandishin and carried unanimously.

c. Mayoral Report

Mayor Miles reported that he attended the St. Louis County Municipal League meeting on March 23 in Valley Park. He said that Redflex gave a little more detailed presentation at that meeting. He said it was very informative, and he believes it is a good safety mechanism for dangerous intersections.

7. REPORTS FROM THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR

a. List of Paid Bills (Warrant dates of March 17 – March 29, 2006)

There were no questions.

b. MEETING WITH SHOP 'N SAVE

Attorney Gunn said there was a meeting the morning of April 3 with himself, along with Mr. Krantz, Mr. Blattner, Paul Hamill, a trustee for Marquette Meadows and a practicing attorney, Mr. Hartzog who is the City Attorney for Twin Oaks, Mr. Cunningham who is special counsel for Twin Oaks, and Mr. Kelly who is the City Administrator regarding the Shop'N Save. He said the meeting was productive, the gentlemen were courteous and afforded more than an hour of their time, and they agreed to meet later because they all agreed there was a need for further discussion. He said that further information was provided this afternoon, and he hopes by the next Board meeting that there is something more concrete to discuss. He said that, again, he would describe their discussions as friendly and productive.

Alderman Clement advised that there is a Planning and Zoning Public Hearing pertaining to Schnucks on Wednesday evening at Twin Oaks. He said that the current Schnucks store lease would not be allowed to go to Shop 'N Save, because it is controlled by Schnucks. He said he didn't believe a supermarket would be allowed to use that space.

8. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

a. Planning and Zoning Commission

1. Minutes of the March 13, 2006 meeting

Alderman Clement said there was a request for a boundary adjustment by Manchester United Methodist Church, and that was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that there was also a request for an 800 foot addition to a dwelling at 315 Royal Village Drive, and that was also approved. He said the Jack-In-The-Box site plan approval was tabled pending a decision by the Board of Aldermen on the pending Bill.

b. Historic Review Commission

Alderman Wandishin said the next meeting would be held on April 18 at 5:15 p.m. at the Public Works Garage.

9. ACTION ON OLD BILLS

a. **SUBSTITUTE BILL # 06-1725 – AN ORDINANCE APPROVING SPECIAL USE PERMIT TO OPERATE A COMBINATION FAST FOOD RESTAURANT AND SERVICE STATION AT 14200-14204 MANCHESTER ROAD**

Alderman Clement read Substitute Bill # 06-1725 for the second time, entitled: "AN ORDINANCE CREATING A SPECIAL USE PERMIT AND GRANTING THE SAME TO JACK-IN-

THE-BOX, INC. TO ENGAGE IN THE OPERATION OF A RESTAURANT WITH A DRIVE-THROUGH FACILITY AS SET FORTH IN ARTICLE 5, SECTION 8.2 OF APPENDIX “B” OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER, AND TO OPERATE AN AUTOMOTIVE SERVICE STATION WITH OTHER RETAIL SALES ON A TRACT OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED IN EXHIBIT “A” ATTACHED HERETO”, by title only.

Alderman Clement asked if there were any questions.

Alderman Ottenad asked about the sound wall and asked about the composition; she quoted the composition requirement and said that when she looked at the picture, it looks like it is a material rather than masonry or split face.

Mr. Scott Fehl, NovaGroup, Inc., 6312 Hazelwest Court, Hazelwood, the architect, said that it is a concrete system with concrete posts with a channel system and the slats fit down into them. He said he believes these would be a better product, because a masonry wall standing in space on its own, over time, would deteriorate. He explained the composition and styles of the slats.

Alderman Tullock asked about the sound abatement or a difference between a flat wall or something rigid, and Scott Fehl said that what they were proposing is what the sound wall is designed to do, whereas a concrete block wall is not necessarily designed to catch sound.

Alderman Clement made the motion that Bill # 06-1725 become Ordinance # 06-1661.

A poll of the Board showed:

Alderman Ottenad – aye
Alderman Clement – aye
Alderman Wilson – aye
Alderman Tullock – aye
Alderman Ruecker – aye
Alderman Wandishin – aye

Mayor Miles announced the motion passed 6 – 0.

b. BILL # 06-1735 – AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AND ENACTING A NEW CODE OF ORDINANCES

Alderman Ruecker read Bill # 06-1735 for the second time, entitled: “AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AND ENACTING A NEW CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER; ESTABLISHING THE SAME; PROVIDING FOR THE REPEAL OF CERTAIN ORDINANCES NOT INCLUDED THEREIN, EXCEPT AS HEREIN EXPRESSLY PROVIDED; PROVIDING FOR THE MANNER OF AMENDING SUCH CODE OF ORDINANCES; PROVIDING PENALTY FOR THE VIOLATION THEREOF; AND PROVIDING WHEN THIS ORDINANCE SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE”, by title only.

Alderman Ruecker said there had been a lot of discussion about this issue, but if members of the Board wanted to discuss it, that would be fine, however, if there is no discussion, he would make the motion that Bill # 06-1735 become Ordinance # 06-1662.

A poll of the Board showed:

Alderman Clement – aye
Alderman Wilson – nay
Alderman Tullock – nay
Alderman Ruecker – aye
Alderman Wandishin – aye
Alderman Ottenad – aye

Mayor Miles announced the motion passed 4 – 2.

c. BILL # 06-1736 – AN ORDINANCE ALLOWING GOVERNMENTAL
USES IN COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS

Alderman Wandishin read Bill # 06-1736 for the second time, entitled: “AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTIONS 8.2 AND 9.2 OF ARTICLE 5 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER (BEING ORDINANCE NO. 78-952 AND APPENDIX “B” OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER) BY ADDING THERETO NEW SECTIONS PERMITTING GOVERNMENTAL USES AS SPECIAL USES IN THE C-1 AND C-2 COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER”, by title only.

Alderman Wandishin made the motion that Bill # 06-1736 become Ordinance # 06-1663.

A poll of the Board showed:

Alderman Wilson – aye
Alderman Tullock – aye
Alderman Ruecker – aye
Alderman Wandishin – aye
Alderman Ottenad – aye
Alderman Clement – aye

Mayor Miles announced the motion passed 6 – 0.

d. BILL # 06-1737 – AN ORDINANCE CONTRACTING FOR CONCRETE
SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT

Alderman Ottenad read Bill # 06-1737 for the second time, entitled: “AN ORDINANCE ACCEPTING THE BID OF SBC CONTRACTING, INC. IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED FORTY-FIVE THOUSAND, SEVEN HUNDRED TWENTY DOLLARS AND EIGHTY-TWO CENTS (\$45,720.82), EXCEPT FOR APPROVED CHANGE ORDER, FOR CONCRETE SIDEWALK REPLACEMENT IN VARIOUS LOCATIONS THROUGHOUT THE CITY OF MANCHESTER AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT THEREFOR”, by title only.

Alderman Ottenad made the motion that Bill # 06-1737 become Ordinance # 06-1664.

A poll of the Board showed:

Alderman Tullock – aye
Alderman Ruecker – aye
Alderman Wandishin – aye
Alderman Ottenad – aye
Alderman Clement – aye
Alderman Wilson – aye

Mayor Miles announced the motion passed 6 – 0.

10. INTRODUCTION OF NEW BILLS

a. BILL CONTRACTING FOR ASPHALT STREET MILLING AND OVERLAY WORK

Alderman Clement introduced Bill # 06-1738, entitled: “AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH PACE CONSTRUCTION/MISSOURI PETROLEUM PRODUCTS COMPANY IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED TWO HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS (\$250,000.00) FOR ASPHALT STREET MILLING AND OVERLAY WORK AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS THROUGHOUT THE CITY OF MANCHESTER”, by title only.

Alderman Clement asked if this process will be used on locations other than LaBonne Parkway, and City Administrator Blattner responded that it would be used on some street intersections at LaBonne Parkway.

Alderman Clement asked if this is successful and cost effective, if this will become a primary method of asphalt street repair moving forward. City Administrator Ed Blattner stated that he certainly hopes so, that Pace and Missouri Petroleum will provide this service next year, as well. He said that he knows there are a number of other cities who are asking him about this process. He said, as is known, this was done three years ago with an out-of-state contractor in the location of Hanna Road basically from Big Bend to the Park, and it is a very effective method of getting a good driving surface and a good wearing surface at a very low cost, it just takes special machinery to do it. He said this is the first time a contractor in the St. Louis area has been able to get one of the machines, and he expects this method will become quite popular.

City Administrator Blattner stated that the men are now doing joint repairs. He described the work being done and said that once the process is done, LaBonne Parkway should look the same from one end to another. Answering Alderman Clement’s question, Mr. Blattner said they would not be doing the curbs; there are other contractors who would do the curbs; that would have to be bid.

No further action at this time.

b. BILL ENTERING INTO AGREEMENT WITH PARKWAY SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR CONTINUATION OF THE SRO PROGRAM

Alderman Ruecker introduced Bill # 06-1739, entitled: "AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE PARKWAY SCHOOL DISTRICT RELATING TO THE SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER PROGRAM", by title only.

No further action at this time.

c. BILL ADOPTING THE AMENDED ELECTRICAL CODE OF ST. LOUIS COUNTY

Alderman Wandishin introduced Bill # 06-1740, entitled: "AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AND ENACTING THE ELECTRICAL CODE OF ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI, AS AMENDED, AS THE ELECTRICAL CODE OF THE CITY OF MANCHESTER, MISSOURI", by title only.

No further action at this time.

d. BILL AUTHORIZING FY 2006 BUDGET ADJUSTMENT

Alderman Ottenad introduced Bill # 06-1741, entitled: "AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 05-1634 ADOPTING AND APPROVING THE BUDGET FOR THE CITY OF MANCHESTER FOR THE YEAR JANUARY 1, 2006 THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2006, BY REVISING THE ESTABLISHED BUDGET FOR THE GENERAL FUND, DEBT SERVICE FUND, TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF) FUND, CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND, PARKS AND STORM WATER PROJECTS FUND, HOMECOMING FUND AND SANITARY SEWER REPAIR FUND", by title only.

No further action at this time.

11. MISCELLANEOUS

a. Comments from the Public

There were none.

12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, at 9:10 p.m., Alderman Wandishin made the motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Alderman Clement and carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Mayor Miles reminded everyone to vote the next day. He thanked everyone for attending the meeting and wished them a good evening.

Respectfully submitted,

Ruth E. Baker, City Clerk